

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,752	07/30/2003	Dennis R. Zimmerman	23055.00	6807
37833	7590 02/01/2005		EXAMINER	
LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD.			WATSON, ROBERT C	
	035 CRYSTAL CITY STAT N. VA 22215	ION	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		3723	
			DATE MAILED: 02/01/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/629,752	ZIMMERMAN, DENNIS R.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Watson	3723	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from t, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (C) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		•	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	·		
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 13 and 15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 8-12,14 and 16-18 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
,	variiner. Note the attached Office	Action of form 1 TO-102.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application of the second in the secon	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Motice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/30/03.		Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/629,752

Art Unit: 3723

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohlengraft in view of Bigham.

Mohlengraft shows a tool having an elongate fulcrum member 24, a hollow lever arm 18,20, and a pull member 74,78 extending from the lever arm.

Bigham teaches the use of a second lever arm section telescoping from a first lever arm section.

To provide in Molengraft a second lever arm section telescoping from a first lever arm section would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the disclosure of Bigham. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to increase the leverage of the lever arm and therefor increase the mechanical advantage. The object that the hook is to engage is a matter of intended use that has no patentable significance. In any case, the Mohlengraft hook is seen to be capable of performing the recited intended use.

Claim13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohlengraft in view of Johnson.

Mohlengraft in Fig. 1 shows a tool having an elongate fulcrum member, a hollow lever arm, and a pull member extending from the lever arm.

Johnson teaches that the hook may be adjustably attached to the chain by a clevis and pin.

To adjustably attach the chain to the hook in Fig. 1 of Mohlengraft with a clevis and pin would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the disclosure of Johnson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to provide a convenient means of attaching the chain to the hook.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohlengraft in view of Johnson as above applied taken with Bigham.

Bigham teaches the use of a second lever arm section telescoping from a first lever arm section.

To provide in Molengraft a second lever arm section telescoping from a first lever arm section would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the disclosure of Bigham. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to increase the leverage of the lever arm and therefor increase the mechanical advantage. The object that the hook is to engage is a matter of intended use that has no patentable significance. In any case, the Mohlengraft hook is seen to be capable of performing the recited intended use.

Claims 8-12, 14, and 16-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-6 are allowed.

Art Unit: 3723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Watson whose telephone number is 703 308-1747. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 5:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail III can be reached on 703 308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rcw

HOBERT C. WATSON PRIMARY EXAMINER